

# MEMORANDUM DECISION

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision is not binding precedent for any court and may be cited only for persuasive value or to establish res judicata, collateral estoppel, or law of the case.



---

APPELLANT *PRO SE*

Michael A. Wilson  
Elkhart, Indiana

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE

Robert J. Palmer  
May•Oberfell•Lorber  
Mishawaka, Indiana

---

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

---

Michael A. Wilson,  
*Appellant-Plaintiff,*

*v.*

Lippert Components Inc.,  
*Appellee-Defendant.*

December 28, 2023

Court of Appeals Case No.  
23A-SC-1788

Appeal from the Elkhart Superior  
Court

The Honorable Dean O. Burton,  
Magistrate

Trial Court Cause No.  
20D05-2301-SC-74

**Memorandum Decision by Judge Bradford**  
Judges Vaidik and Brown concur.

**Bradford, Judge.**

## Case Summary

- [1] Michael A. Wilson appeals from the trial court’s entry of judgment in favor of Lippert Components Inc. We affirm.

## Facts and Procedural History

- [2] In a dispute, the dimensions of which are not entirely clear from the record on appeal but appears to involve claims of identity theft, tax fraud, and a reduction in Social Security disability benefits, Wilson sued Lippert on January 12, 2023. On July 14, 2023, following a bench trial, the trial court entered judgment in favor of Lippert, concluding that Wilson had failed to prove damages by a preponderance of the evidence.

## Discussion and Decision

- [3] Wilson seems to be arguing only that the trial court erred in failing to compel Lippert to comply with a subpoena *duces tecum*. Due to a lack of cogent argument, we are unable to review this argument on the merits. Indiana Rule of Appellate Procedure 46(A)(8)(a) requires an appellant to include an argument section which must contain the contentions on the issues presented, supported by cogent reasoning, to be supported by citations to authority and the record. Wilson’s argument wholly fails to comply with these requirements. Wilson does cite some authority but fails to explain how that authority supports his argument. Indeed, we are at something of a loss to understand exactly what Wilson’s argument *is*, as he does not explain how the trial court’s allegedly erroneous failure to compel Lippert to comply with a subpoena *duces tecum*

relates to his claims of identity theft or how it prejudiced him. In short, Wilson's claims on appeal are not supported by cogent argument and are therefore waived. *See, e.g., Cooper v. State*, 854 N.E.2d 831, 834, n.1 (Ind. 2006).

[4] The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

Vaidik, J., and Brown, J., concur.